



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,001	09/27/2001	Sanaa F. Abdelhadi	AUS920010903US1	2725

7590 04/07/2005
Mr. Volel Emile
P.O. Box 202170
Austin, TX 78720-2170

EXAMINER

RAMPURIA, SATISH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2191

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/965,001

Applicant(s)

ABDELHADI ET AL.

Examiner

Satish S. Rampuria

Art Unit

2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment received on 11/11/2004.
2. New Claims added by the applicant - 7.
3. Claims amended by the applicant - 1, 3, and 5.
4. Claims pending in the application - 1-7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2004/0139430 to Eatough et al. (hereinafter called Eatough) in view of US Patent No. 6,151,023 to Chari (hereinafter called Chari) and further in view of Published document "System for Accessing a Mainframe From a Workstation User Interface" by IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (hereinafter, IBMTDB), Vol. 32 published in Sep 1989.

Per claim 1 and 7:

Eatough disclose:

- A method of interfacing an existing system management user interface running on a first computer system with a new system management software utility running on a second computer system in a network (page 2, paragraph 23 "existing systems... require

Art Unit: 2191

learning a new interface or packaging all application... before changing the package... using one consistent interface for all package formats and operating systems, the user does not have to learn multiple interfaces and methods for managing packages” and page 1, paragraph 15 “the consistency allows all X-packages 120 to be managed in a single user interface”), said second computer system having a network address and page 1, paragraph 11 “MVPM system... include a distribution management server”), said method comprising the steps of:

- providing a set of specifications for interfacing the new user interface with a plurality of software management utilities, including the (page 1, paragraph 12 “MVPM (multiple vender package management)... include a distribution management server... containing software... distributed...” software management system utility running on the second computer system (page 1, paragraph 13 “package importer 108 receives the vendor-specific software package... a new package document referred to as an X-package 120... the X-package 120 may include an Extensible Markup Language (XML) package document” and page 1, paragraph 12 “include target computer... destination... software”);
- determining the software management system utility running on the second computer system by (page 1, paragraph 14 “importer... verify... identity... control list... software package... signed”);

Eatough does not explicitly disclose using a cross-referencing table to cross-reference the network address of the computer system with the new system management software utility.

However, Chari discloses in an analogous computer system using a cross-referencing table to cross-reference the network address of the computer system with the new system management software utility (col. 14, lines 37-48 “MIB Manager Module 402 invokes the MIB Section Module's "retrieve data" function... MIB Section Module... used to retrieve MIB data contained in a table or organized in a group of variables... MIB Section Module 404 invokes the SNMP Module's GET NEXT function... continues to retrieve data until there are no more variables in the MIB table” and Figs. 7-12B and related discussion).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of retrieving the information from the table until all variable met as taught by Chari into the method of system management software in multivender environment as taught by Eatough. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to map the network address/variable for the application deploying on the network server/computer in server management application to improve efficiency and provide less costly productivity as suggested by Chari (col. 6, lines 34-48).

Neither Eatough nor Chari disclose interfacing, using specifications from the set of specifications, the user interface with the software utility running on the second computer system.

However, IBMTDB discloses in an analogous computer system interfacing (Section, Disclosure Text “workstation user interface”), using specifications from the set of specifications (Section, Disclosure Text “profile, a file on the workstation, describes the relationship between

Art Unit: 2191

the interfaces of the mainframe applications and workstation program”), the user interface with the software utility running on the second computer system (Section, Disclosure Text “system... improve the usability without changing the mainframe applications”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of using the specification to interface with the software running on a computer as taught by IBMTDB into the combination system of method for retrieving the information from the table until all variable met and the method of system management software in multivendor environment as taught by Eatough and Chari. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use the specs to interface with the software running on a computer to improve the usability without changing the mainframe applications running on them as suggested by IBMTDB (see Section, Disclosure Text).

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Eatough disclose wherein said table includes code to translate communications between said user interface and said new system management software utility (page 2, paragraph 21 “The process includes importing a vendor-specific software package 102 using an XML vendor package template 110 at 200”).

Eatough does not explicitly disclose cross-reference table.

However, Chari disclose in an analogous computer system cross-reference table (col. 12, lines 24-26 “Network Map Window Module 422... discover the number of servers... in the network...” and col. 14, lines 37-48 “MIB Manager Module 402 invokes the MIB Section Module's "retrieve data" function... MIB Section Module... used to retrieve MIB data contained in a table or organized in a group of variables... MIB Section Module 404 invokes the SNMP Module's GET NEXT function... continues to retrieve data until there are no more variables in the MIB table” and Figs. 7-12B and related discussion).

The feature of cross-reference table would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 3 is the computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 1 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 1 above.

Claim 4 is the computer program product claim corresponding to method claim 2 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 2 above.

Claim 5 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 1 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 1 above.

Claim 6 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 2 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 2 above.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 has been considered but are moot in view of new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Satish S. Rampuria** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3732**. The examiner can normally be reached on **8:30 am to 5:00 pm** Monday to Friday except every other Friday and federal holidays. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100**

Art Unit: 2191

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Tuan Q. Dam** can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satish S. Rampuria

Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2124
4/4/2005



WEI Y. ZHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER